

TWEEDLEDUM MAJOR AND TWEEDLEDEE KINNOCK

THE end of the summer has brought the election nearer. Leaving aside the unknown factor of the Liberal Democrats, one of the two main parties should get a working majority. A government will then be formed, and the other party will use every trick in the book to stop the first one governing Britain, the British taxpayer paying the salaries of both sides. This antiquated knock-about farce has not been modernised for 300 years as Sir Oswald Mosley said.

Nevertheless, despite the furious personal attacks, the election will be a battle between Tweedledum and Tweedledee. Never were the Labour and Tory parties more alike, especially since Mr. Kinnock gentrified the Labour Party and started purging his Militants. How a Labour government would be running the country a year after taking office is, of course, another matter.

ALIKE IN THEIR SCANDALS

The two parties are so similar that they follow a pattern. Labour was once the party of Kilkenny cats when the Tories were serenely united. Now the Tories are as divided as the cats of Kilkenny and Labour is united. But the election will bring the Tories together as one man.

They even copy each other's scandals. The government and the governor of the Bank of England have been under fire ever since the Bank of Credit and Commerce International crashed, but the official inquiry should establish whether their part was any worse than a negligent one. Mr. Kinnock however has been carrying on as if an enormous sink of iniquity had been uncovered, never heard of before in the long history of the Mother of Parliaments.

Come off it Kinnock! Labour blotted its own copybook many years ago. A short time after the 1939/45 war, two members of the Attlee government and one director of the Bank of England, a former trade union official, were involved in the Sidney Stanley scandal. Though not prosecuted, they showed that the Labour Party was anything but an assembly of saints.

SHIELDING THE TRAITORS

Far more serious were the roles both parties played in security scandals. When Burgess and Maclean fled the country in 1950 they left behind a cancer of treason that had spread right through the Establishment. The Labour government of the day not only failed to root out this treason; it also blundered dismally when the Communist pair absconded. But the moment they were on the run, Mr. Attlee's government hastily rallied to cover up the trail. More importantly, it stood firmly in the way of any official inquiry into the full extent of the treason.

Five years later the Tories were in power. Rumours abounded that "Kim" Philby had tipped off the two runaways, and in 1955 Harold Macmillan, then Foreign Secretary, rose in the House of Commons to "clear" Philby. "I have no reason to conclude that Mr. Philby has at any time betrayed the interests of this country" stated Macmillan. Thus one of the most dangerous KGB agents Britain ever produced and nurtured was off the

hook and could not be brought to justice.

These are old scandals. But they showed that Labour and Tory governments both shielded traitors, acting out the roles of Tweedledum and Tweedledee in their bumbling ineffectiveness.

OFF WITH THEIR HEADS ?

Even in their electioneering the two parties copy each other. In January Labour published its "Charter of Rights" and in July the Tories replied with the "Citizens Charter". As always in vote-catching, they had a lot to say about "rights" but not so much about "duties".

But the real point about this "chartering" is its sheer irrelevance when set beside the big issue facing Britain, today's economic situation. This recession is different from previous recessions because of the huge debts carried by companies and the tough new attitude of the banks. Both Midland and Barclays have warned they are tightening up on future lending.

The Chancellor babbles about a coming "recovery" but this would need bigger loans. If the banks are going to be tight-fisted about lending and heavily-indebted firms are bound to be cautious about borrowing, what chance has a real "recovery" got? The Tories simply have no policy to break the deadlock; Labour claims to have such a policy but has no conception of the magnitude of the task, nor indeed how to cope with the recession's mass unemployment.

Queen Marie Antoinette said "Let them eat cake" when told the French people were hungry. "Charters" are the cake offered by Labour and the Tories when Britain needs the more substantial fare of an effective policy to bring the recession to an end. Tweedledum Major and Tweedledee Kinnock are fortunate that the British people are not yet demanding their heads.

MOSCOW GROWS OVER CROATIA

THE conflict in Croatia has brought growls from Moscow. Croatia is a poorly-armed republic which declared its independence and was immediately attacked by the well-armed Yugoslav army. It has also been attacked by Serbian "Chetnik" guerrillas, who plan to drive the Croats out of their villages and grab their land to make a "Greater Serbia". This is the goal of the Serbian leader Milosevich, and he's still a Communist under his nationalist skin. He is Yugoslavia's cuckoo-in-the-nest, the notorious bird which grows big and fat by throwing weaker birds out.

Now Moscow has taken a hand in this infamous game. European Community leaders, so far very ineffectively, have been trying to patch up peace in Croatia. Moscow has been growling "don't interfere in Yugoslavia's internal affairs". What has Yugoslavia got to do with the Soviets? Nobody is interfering in Soviet internal affairs. Even Tito broke away from Stalin nearly 40 years ago. These Kremlin rumblings are themselves interference in Croatia's internal affairs.

But Moscow interferes on the side of the aggressors. It opposes all small countries who want their freedom. It has one nearer home in Lithuania, where six frontier guards were massacred recently, and everybody in Lithuania believes this was done by Soviet "special forces".

The collapse of the Moscow coup and defeat of the hard-liners by Boris Yeltsin and the Russian people should be followed up with an end to the repression of small nations, inside and outside the Soviet Union. Tell expansionists like Milosevich to pipe down. Let the Croats be free too.

MUCH ADO ABOUT "PROTECTIONISM"

THE recent "G7" summit in London was hailed as a landmark in the history of mankind. In fact it was a squalid exercise in evasion. Supposed to deal with "world problems", it dealt with Soviet problems by presenting President Gorbachev with a wet codfish. Though an "economic" summit its approach to the economic problems of the non-Soviet world was all show and no action.

To be sure, as parsons denounce sin, Mr. Major made a mighty speech denouncing "protectionism". The Ottawa summit of 1981 also declared it to be sinful, as did the Williamsburg summit in 1983 and the Houston summit in 1990. That makes ten years of righteous indignation but no action. Not to be outdone, Mrs. Thatcher at her own personal summit in New York in June said she had to stop the world "slipping back into protectionism and give a new momentum to free trade".

Free trade? It died in 1914, like a lot of other things. Mussolini was once condemned for calling liberty "a stinking corpse". He was stating the obvious. It had perished in many lands at the time. Even today, when fascism is no more and communism is in eclipse, the *Times* has said that in over 100 "democratic" member-states of the United Nations many freedoms were suppressed.

THE RESULT OF WAR

The sooner politicians stop their fine manly posturing over "protectionism" and see it as an economic question instead of the work of the Devil, the better. Free trade suffered a mortal blow when war broke out in 1914. Britain had done well from it until then. We were the world's leading manufacturer, with only Germany as a serious rival from 1910. What happened when those two nations started fighting? They cut down exporting in order to produce arms and win the war.

This left their pre-war customers short of manufactured goods. They did not stay short for long. Some of them industrialised themselves in a hurry. But when they knew they would face severe competition from British exporters once peace returned, they protected their new industries with high import duties. Thus existing "protectionism" gained a whole new dimension and there was no sin about it. It was a natural economic consequence of war.

Sir Oswald Mosley showed in "The Greater Britain" that, over the ten years 1914/24, import duties on manufactured goods rose 20 per cent on average in South Africa, 56 per cent in Australia and almost 300 per cent in India. British exporters

had to face these barriers after 1918, one reason why British trade never regained the favourable position it enjoyed before 1914.

FIGHTING FASCISM

It happened again with the second world war, only more so. American Lend Lease alone enabled Britain to stay in the war after 1941, and it must be said that President Roosevelt was most generous in providing arms and supplies for "the common struggle against fascism". But there was an iron hand inside the glove of friendship. Britain was strictly forbidden to use any Lend Lease supplies for exporting. When our own production went almost entirely into the war effort, this meant once again that normal trade virtually ceased to exist while the war lasted.

Furthermore Roosevelt, unlike Churchill, also saw the war as a crusade against "colonialism". The post-war world turned out much as he planned. Not only the British but all the European colonial empires were swept away. A world of many new nations arose, all a-bounce and agog with the importance of their newly independent status, demanding access to the trade of the globe. But the high-minded President had told the glowering Churchill this was no more than their right.

How did they go about it? They did what Australia, South Africa and India had done in the first war. Many become manufacturers to prove their virility, using low wages and new technology to compete on world markets. Indeed the GATT (another Rooseveltian brain-child) awarded them special privileges as "developing nations". While agitating for full access to the British market most of them practised half-a-dozen kinds of trade protection at home.

BRAVE NEW WORLD ?

Today we have President Roosevelt's brave new world fully blown and starting to wilt. Mrs. Thatcher wants to add momentum to the "stinking corpse" of free trade in a world which would never tolerate it. Mr. Major denounces "protectionism" to the applause of politicians who all practice it. While this grim farce proceeds, the great central fact is that the GATT system embraces 107 competing nations, each intent on selling more to the other 106 than it buys from them, all the time using a variety of protectionist devices to keep down imports. Every nation wants to enjoy a "favourable trade balance" which only a minority can possibly achieve.

As for the lamented Uruguay Round, the Europeans alone are

tarred with the "protectionist" brush because they resist opening their big market to all the other protectionists. In fact, they import billions-worth of farm products they could grow at home, and have done so for years. It is true their subsidies are too large, but so are America's. Because of that country's huge size, U.S. farm support has created enormous surpluses which Washington wants to unload in Europe. Some debt-ridden Third World countries demand the right to send food to a Europe which does not need it, though the great majority of the hungry lands are in the Third World.

This way lies madness. We propose three things to sort out the mess:

(1) Divide the world into several "continental areas", in each of which full production should be consumed at home by higher living standards, not by exporting it into world trade.

(2) Europe can feed itself in the main foodstuffs. So can America and other big producers. Let each ensure its own people are properly fed, giving its farmers a long-term contract to grow food at steady prices. Then pool their surpluses to feed the hungry lands. Not by dumping food and ruining Third World farmers, but assisting them to make local food supplies adequate.

(3) Then scale down the over-large subsidies. Farmers should be set free to produce to their best, under a new system of fair and not outrageous prices, giving them a living standard as good as in the towns. But something must also be done about their debts.

A LETTER ON LEFT-WING HYPOCRISY

Sir — The sickening hypocrisy of Left-wing clergy, politicians and journalists is reaching new depths in hysteria over the South African government's support for Inkatha. The pro-communist ANC is funded by Leftists in many countries, and it continues to advocate sanctions, which of course hurt poor South Africans of all races and religions.

The SA government was wise to support anti-Marxist organisations in South Africa.

Our Leftist bishops, clergy and MPs abuse South Africa but remain quiet about Red China's infamous crimes in Tibet, the Soviet illegal occupation of the Baltic states and the savage Indonesian atrocities in East Timor. I appeal to your readers to show their disgust at all this hypocrisy by (a) purchasing South African produce and (b) opposing all sanctions.

"Merseysider"

The Editor adds: The Left would have a better case if they condemned all political funding in South Africa. Chief Buthelezi retorted to the big fuss over SA government money for Inkatha by saying the ANC also takes SA government money. He said the government has given large sums for resettlement of ANC members returning home from abroad. "If it's tainted, how can the ANC take it?". Can we now look forward to

the Left condemning the ANC and Pretoria for this?

Buthelezi also said the money received by Inkatha was "piffling" compared with "the millions the ANC are getting from around the world", naming the KGB, the

Palestine Liberation Organisation and Libya as financial backers. The KGB money speaks for itself, but when Colonel Gaddafi's Libya and the PLO have put up "millions" this is as tainted as the money Gaddafi gave to the IRA. What a rumpus

there was when Gaddafi financed Irish terrorism—and what a silence over his financial support of the ANC, the white-headed boys of many British politicians, journalists and clergy. As our reader says, their hypocrisy stinks.

THE MAN WHO SURVIVED IT ALL

ON July 26th the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party "consigned communism to history", in the words of the *Times*. This does not mean the Communist Party will disappear. It is above all the "club" of the Soviet elite. And a good example of the ability of old Reds to survive was Lazar Kaganovich, Stalin's henchman and brother-in-law, one of the most hated "hard men" in the dictator's machinery of terror. Kaganovich survived many changes in the Soviet Union, to die in his bed on July 25th, the day before the Central Committee drew the curtains on his creed.

He was born in 1893, the son of a tailor in a little Jewish village in the Pripet Marshes near the border with Ukraine. He did not spare his own people in his rise to power, handing over his sister to Stalin. "She suffered the same treatment as Stalin's first two wives" said the *Independent*. "Several members of his own family finished their days in the Gulag, where he did nothing to help them. He drove others to suicide". One was his brother, who shot himself when Kaganovich informed him Stalin had marked him down among the "right-wingers".

HE DID NOT spare Communists either. By 1925 Kaganovich was busy purging them in the Ukraine, "sending dozens to the Gulag". Some of the more powerful ones

complained about him to Stalin, on which the latter recalled him to Moscow—for promotion! "Stalin loved Kaganovich for three things" said the *Independent*. "He was a workaholic, he had no opinions of his own and he was ready to execute any order". Such men were invaluable for what Stalin planned for Russia.

During the 1930s he was successively in charge of transport, heavy industry, fuel and oil in the Soviet Union, using "relentless exploitation and terror to raise productivity". Stalin sent him to the front during the war with Germany, where he "organised the draconian military prosecution system, resulting in countless executions of innocent people". This was Stalin's reply to the great Soviet defeats of 1941/42. The man Churchill praised as "our gallant Russian ally" turned defeat into victory mainly by the pitiless treatment of his own troops carried out by the mass liquidation edicts of the workaholic Kaganovich.

But then, mass liquidation was commonplace in the Red Army. Time and again, defaulters were driven forward slowly over German minefields to detonate the mines at great loss of life, while behind them machine-gunners wiped out any waverers. General Ratov, head of the Soviet Military Mission in Britain during the war, actually refused an offer of British mine-detectors.

"In the Soviet Union we use people" he explained. Were not generals who used "people" to clear minefields war criminals? This had been standard practice ever since Lenin, regarded by many in the West as no worse than a misguided genius, had ordered 10,000 "class enemies" from St. Petersburg to be herded towards the White trenches in the Civil War in 1919, with "machine-guns to the rear of them".

THIS raises a point. Our House of Commons (despite the opposition of the House of Lords) has just passed a War Crimes Act, and a special department at New Scotland Yard is collecting information for the prosecution of some aged Balts alleged to have committed war crimes. Was not Kaganovich, Stalin's henchman who slaughtered masses of defeated Red Army troops to stiffen morale, a far greater war criminal? What sort of justice is it which tries the small men but allows monsters like Stalin's executioner to die peacefully and obscurely in their beds?

We have long stood for a complete end to the whole monstrous perversion of justice known as war crimes trials. But a British Conservative government has revived them, and in Germany, democratic Germany, the one-sided trials still continue. That is the sort of relentless perseverance Kaganovich would thoroughly approve.

The Open Eye . . . of Paul Collins

TWO IRA terrorists escape from Brixton jail, despite a tip-off to the authorities by a prison officer said to be a paid Special Branch informer.

The Governor, who passed this information on to the Home Office before making his own seemingly inadequate counter-measures, is instructed to take pre-retirement leave—in effect seven weeks' additional paid holiday.

A Home Office official within the Directorate of Custody, and presumably a central figure in this farrago, awaits promotion to a post at the Gaming Board.

His chief executive, the Home Secretary Kenneth Baker, feigns anger, makes bluster a substitute for firm action, and thanks his stars that Parliament is in summer recess. The terrorists have sprung their cells but Mr. Baker stays in office.

The Governor's senior colleagues express outrage at his treatment, and the Association of First Division Civil Servants publicly criticises the action taken against their colleague.

The terrorists still remain at large.

I do not say that this story could only take place in Britain. But as a saga of ineptitude, shiftiness, self-righteous irresponsibility, whingeing and me-firstism, it has all the marks of our ruling Establishment.

MRS. WINNIE MANDELA, who manages to combine the charms of Madame Defarge and Mrs. Danvers, has been holidaying with her husband in Cuba, "our second home" as she remarked to local party functionaries.

This must be an uncomfortable allusion for her Western liberal apologists, but an accurate one I have no doubt. As South Africa, that beautiful country of vast potential and numerous Western betrayals descends towards chaos, the squalor of Castro's thirty-years-old regime offers a sure model and prospectus for ANC ambitions.

At one point during the visit, the Mandelas accompanied Castro on an official function, the white bearded Marxist appearing tieless with shirt top unbuttoned. It might have been the heat, or the force of

sartorial habit. Or perhaps he had heard of Mrs. Mandela's way with neckwear.

LAZAR KAGANOVICH has died in obscurity aged 97. Not a name that will mean much to the public at large, or even to the casual reader of 20th century history. A former orchestral conductor, perhaps, or a long-retired chess Grand Master. Kaganovich was both a conductor and a mover of pawns, but in spheres little understood in the West or what is called "the world community".

He was one of Stalin's most ruthless allies, largely responsible for the forced collectivisations of the 1920s and 1930s and the ferocious party purges of the years immediately before the last world war. At least 11 million are estimated to have died in the ten-year programme, with another 3.5 million expiring in the Gulags after resisting forced migration.

Kaganovich was no armchair executioner. He personally supervised suppression, putting down peasant uprisings and punishing whole areas by seizing foodstuffs and creating artificial famines.

These were the years, of course, when principled souls as diverse as Blunt, Philby, Denis Healey and a whole generation of Cambridge intellectuals, scribblers and exquisites were enrolling in the Communist Party, the better to fight fascism. And Mr. Churchill was holding cosy little anti-German soirees with the Soviet Ambassador to London.

Cunning and ability are said to be the principal reasons why Kaganovich, one of the few Jews in the higher reaches of the Kremlin, survived the course. Now Kaganovich has gone. His name has not entered the demonology of the 20th century, his life and terrible deeds have not been immortalised by Hollywood, pondered upon by Western playwrights, illuminated and underscored by television film makers, revived periodically by the press and made the subject of homilies by Western political leaders. And, unlike the second world war victims of the Germans, those of Stalin, Kaganovich and their fellow-commissars lie

forgotten and largely disregarded by Communist rulers, Western toadies and "liberal progressive" opinion. But if they are "forgotten", the numberless prey of Communist barbarity and "democratic" cant have at least been spared the "honour" of being turned into a multi-million pound media industry.

TERESA GORMAN, the Billericay politician whose personality for some quite unfounded and illogical cause I confuse with Cynthia Payne, the householder from Streatham, has been en fete to journalists following her High Court libel victory.

Mrs. Gorman is an archetypal Thatcherite, sometimes described as the most rightwing woman at Westminster. She approves of abortion on demand, wholesale privatisation, and thinks that ticket touts are fine and enterprising fellows.

Some of those long accustomed to be described as "right-wing extremists" will reflect once again that genuine far-right values and sentiments are usually far removed from their own. Mrs. Gorman is unlikely to win any votes from *Action* readers.

The free market philosophy, she told the *Sunday Express*, "is not just about making big profits. It has a complete, sustainable intellectual philosophy behind it.

"Is the state there to serve the people, or are the people to serve the state?"

Are these objectives mutually exclusive? I would say that the state should serve the people, and the people should give service to the state, the two elements, individual and collective, bound in a dynamic, organic whole. Oswald Mosley put it this way. "We take the view that the patriot is not only the man who loves his country, but one who is determined to build a country worthy of that love, and who dedicates himself to the service of the nation which he loves".

There is no mention of patriotism or service in Mrs. Gorman's brief credo. And for the moment the cynical, materialistic, self-centredness and greed of Thatcherism runs like a sour corrosive smell through this unhappy land.

THEIR WORLD AND OURS - LET THEM GO HANG!

"IS it not the object of your organisation to hang together?" asked Mr. John Flowers KC, of Sir Oswald Mosley.

"I trust not to hang together" replied Mosley.

The occasion was the trial at Lewes Assizes in 1934 of Mosley and some of his supporters on a charge of riotous assembly.

Mosley was ably defended by Sir Patrick Hastings KC and after his cross-examination of the Chief Constable, who stated that he had been present at the meeting in plain clothes, the case collapsed.

The jury informed the judge, Mr. Justice Branson, that they did not wish to hear any more and he said he thoroughly agreed with the jury in dismissing the charge.

At a subsequent meeting in Worthing (where the mythical offence was alleged to have occurred) Mosley remarked that he understood local solicitors were now marking their briefs "no flowers, by request."

A Hung Parliament

I WAS recently reminded of this occasion when I read that opinion pollsters and political commentators were forecasting that the next General Election was likely to result in a "hung" Parliament.

They did not mean, of course, that honourable members of that Parliament would end their lives on the end of a rope, but that Neil Kinnock would not enjoy a clear majority over the Conservative representatives and the minor parties in the House.

He would be forced to seek support in the division lobbies from the Liberal Democrats, Scottish and Welsh nationalists, Ulster Unionists any any Independents who might have been returned.

Back to the Twenties

IN 1929 a Labour government under Ramsay MacDonald found itself outnumbered by the massed ranks of Conservative and Liberal members on the opposition benches.

What should MacDonald do? He was offered advice by the young Oswald Mosley, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster in that government.

He should, urged Mosley, introduce radical socialist measures and if defeated in the House by a Tory-Liberal alliance call another General Election.

Let him go to the country and appeal for a working majority and a clear mandate to implement the policies for which the electorate had voted.

MacDonald would have none of it and watered down his policies in the hope of winning sufficient votes in division to convert anaemic Bills into sickly Acts, while he spent his evenings wooing (in the most innocent sense of that word) society hostesses.

He had taken the first steps on the slippery slopes which led to the betrayal of every socialist principle in which the Labour Party had professed to believe, culminating in the formation of the so-called National Government, Tory in everything but name.

It took the rump of the Labour Party many years in the political wilderness (and a disastrous war) before it again enjoyed (the operative word) the fruits of office.

Other Methods

THERE are alternative measures open to a minority in Parliament, but they are usually practised by the Opposition.

Readers will recall the Tories attempting to dislodge Wilson from his seat on a precarious majority, employing such "democratic" manoeuvres as creeping up the Thames in a boat to pour into the division lobbies while Labour members were relaxing in the bars.

But what will Neil Kinnock do, if he really succeeds John Major as Prime Minister?

He cannot follow the Mosley advice of 1929 and introduce radical socialist measures, because the Labour Party abandoned these many years ago.

A Labour government will attempt to make the present obsolete economic system work a little more efficiently than it does under the Tories.

When that fails and crisis deepens there will be increasing talk of the need for a coalition government of the major political parties.

Let it never be forgotten that they are parties of failure and that a coalition of two or more failures can never produce success: in the words of the oft-quoted Mosley aphorism, zero plus zero will always equal zero.

The Alternative

THE solution to all Britain's problems lies in her withdrawal from the world trading system into a truly united Europe and "Europe overseas", developing the vast resources of that "third force" not for export but for consumption by its peoples, and employing its surpluses to assist the hungry nations of the world.

In previous issues of "Action" I have stressed that the world has moved out of the era of public meetings for the propagation of such policies, into the age of television and of the written word.

There has been a magnificent response in recent months to my appeals for increased support for our monthly journal "Action" and our quarterly magazine "Lodestar".

With access to television denied us, these publications and our books provide our only means of propagating our radical alternative to the present system.

Increased sales, subscriptions and donations have done much to relieve the financial pressures under which we have laboured for years.

As this issue of "Action" went to Press we were within £3,920 of our target for the year.

We could raise this sum if more individual subscribers switched to monthly bulk orders of ten copies or more, which we would supply to them on credit, at a generous discount—or at least increased their subscription order from one to two copies per issue.

"Lodestar" is not yet enjoying the circulation it deserves and I look forward to receiving next week £5 annual subscriptions from new readers.

Help us to propagate our radical alternative to a hung Parliament.

JEFFREY HAMM

THIS IS NOT A FREESHEET — SUBSCRIBE NOW!

To: Sanctuary Press Ltd.,
167 Fishponds Road, LONDON SW17

Please supply one/two/three copies of Action per issue for 12 issues.

1 copy	£3.90
2 copies	£5.70
3 copies	£7.50

Name

Address

"LODESTAR"

No. 19, ROBERT SAUNDERS, OBE on
Crisis in the Countryside.
BROCARD SEWELL on
The Practice of Biography.
RONALD WOOD on
Some Thoughts on Reading
Mosley's Introduction to Goethe's
"Faust."
LEONARD WISE on
Graham Greene: An Unappreciation.
JEFFREY HAMM on
"The Holy Fox."
PETER WALLIS on
some Henry Williamson reprints.

Copies of Nos. 2-18 available at £1.20 each.
Subscription: £5 for four issues, payable to
Sanctuary Press Ltd.